

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FOUR

In re A.L. et al., Persons Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY CHILDREN
& FAMILY SERVICES BUREAU,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

B.M.,

Defendant and Appellant.

A137666

(Contra Costa County
Super. Ct. No. J1101032, J1200703)

B.M. (Mother) appeals orders of the juvenile court denying her Welfare and Institutions Code¹ section 388 petitions and orders terminating her parental rights to her two daughters, A.L. and V.S.²

A section 300 petition was filed as to then five-year-old A.L. in July 2011. Mother waived reunification services as to A.L., and in November 2011, the juvenile court terminated reunification services and ordered a permanency planning hearing pursuant to section 366.26 (.26 hearing). The court advised Mother that she needed to

¹ All statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code.

² Mother's notices of appeal state they are from "all orders." The children's fathers are not parties to this appeal.

file a petition for an extraordinary writ in order to seek appellate review of the order setting the .26 hearing. The record contains no indication that Mother filed a writ petition.

A section 300 petition was filed as to then one-month-old V.S. in May 2012. At the recommendation of Children and Family Services (the Department), the juvenile court denied Mother reunification services as to V.S. on August 24, 2012 and set a .26 hearing. The court again advised Mother of the need to file a petition for extraordinary writ in order to preserve her appellate rights. The record contains no indication that she filed such a petition.

Mother filed petitions pursuant to section 388 as to both children on September 25, 2012, seeking reunification services and contending her circumstances had changed in that she had attended a substance abuse and anger management program while incarcerated, she had completed parenting classes, and she had applied for a residential program. On December 12, 2012, the juvenile court found there had been no change in circumstance that would justify changing the order denying reunification services and that services would not be in V.S.'s best interest, and denied the section 388 petition as to V.S. The court found V.S. would be adopted and that there was no significant relationship between Mother and V.S., and terminated Mother's parental rights to V.S. At the same hearing, Mother withdrew her section 388 petition as to A.L. On January 11, 2013, the juvenile court terminated Mother's parental rights to A.L.

Mother's appointed counsel has filed a no issues statement pursuant to *In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952, stating that she has reviewed the entire record and found no arguable issues to raise on appeal. Counsel has also informed Mother that she may file a letter with the court suggesting errors to be reviewed on appeal. Mother has responded with a letter that presents various issues she believes this court should review.

The juvenile court's decision is presumed correct unless appellant can establish that the trial court has committed prejudicial error. "An appealed-from judgment or order is presumed correct. [Citation.] Hence, the appellant must make a challenge. In doing so, he must raise claims of reversible error or other defect [citation], and 'present

argument and authority on each point made' [citations]. If he does not, he may, in the court's discretion, be deemed to have abandoned his appeal. [Citation.] In that event, it may order dismissal." (*In re Sade C.*, *supra*, 13 Cal.4th at p. 994.)

We have reviewed Mother's letter brief, and conclude she has raised no arguable issues regarding the orders from which she timely appealed. Mother did not challenge the orders setting the .26 hearings by petition for extraordinary writ, and has accordingly forfeited her challenge to those orders. (See § 366.26, subd. (1)(1) & (2).) Mother's letter brief provides no reasoned argument or authority showing the trial court abused its discretion in denying her section 388 petition as to V.S. or that its actions at the .26 hearings were improper.

Having found no cognizable claim of trial court error in Mother's letter brief, we conclude Mother has implicitly abandoned her appeal.

DISPOSITION

The appeal is dismissed.

Rivera, J.

We concur:

Ruvolo, P.J.

Reardon, J.